

Date: Thu, 22 Sep 94 04:30:13 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #458
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Thu, 22 Sep 94 Volume 94 : Issue 458

Today's Topics:

Deaf Ham & CW
Re: 5 wpm, you can too!
Sum'tin for nut'in and chicks for free

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 21 Sep 94 20:07:48 GMT
From: washpenn!swider@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Deaf Ham & CW
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I'm currently in the process of studying for my license exam and I happened
to show a friend some books that described what amateur radio is all about.
Now the interesting thing is that he's deaf (hearing impaired, if you prefer).
After reading some of the information, he's interested in giving it a try.
His main interest was packet and although he can gain access to this via
the no-code exam, what about upgrading? Obviously he can't pass a
conventional CW test, how does the FCC handle this?

Thanks in advance for any replies...
Rob
washpenn!swider@uunet.uu.net

Date: Wed, 21 Sep 1994 20:19:00 EST

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!cs.utexas.edu!convex!
news.duke.edu!eff!wariat.org!amcomp!dan@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Re: 5 wpm, you can too!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Earl=Morse%EMC=Srvc%Eng=Hou@bangate.compaq.com writes:

>The best thing about opinions is that everyone has one. Here are mine:

Yes. And I found yours interesting (I was tempted to say enlightening but that might have been misunderstood.)

>IMHO, a once in a lifetime 13 WPM code test won't keep out the lids. Nothing >will keep out all the lids. A recurrent code requalification test would probably,

>IMO, reduce the lid count substantially. I base this on the fact that among those

>that operate CW on a regular basis I have found less lids than on the phone >portion of the band. Could be because it is easier to call somebody a clueless >a**hole on phone than on CW. Not that I haven't heard the little used MF and >FU LID prosigns on CW, but not nearly as much as on SSB.

Here I could not agree more. If the purpose of the morse tests is a lid filter, maybe for other reasons, periodic testing (every 2 years? 5?) on a pass/fail basis should be a requirement. Including current license holders.

>Allocations and band edges are rules issues and the safety issues are one of >the biggest laughs on the tests today. We tell people to tilt their handhelds >away from their heads while using the hambands, then the same people >stick an 800 MHz flip fone antenna in their ears. "I don't have to worry >about safety, it's a cell phone not a ham radio."

Let me take this one piece at a time. Memorizing band edges does nothing. Many hams (newer ones) that operate HF use the charts that the ARRL and others publish while they operate. Memorizing bands is just that, memorization for the purpose of memorization.

Saftey issues are a joke, agreed totally. That area need drastic improvement. Increasing the question pool significantly and adding questions to the exams to cover it. Particularly in the Novice, Tech and General pools.

>I don't understand what more could you want? You can already operate most >of the available bandwidth without having to learn the code.

Ok, VE Privileges. Licensee of a space station. Not to mention the fact that the 50Mhz plus spectrum is fundamentally different from the 30Mhz

minus spectrum.

>>The points in these posts boild down to basically "I had to so you have to"
>>or "why gripe and whine, it isn't that hard". What you completely fail to
>>realize (or refuse to realize?) is that that is not the point. You miss the
>>whole arguement by at least a thousand miles. The purposes of the ARS are
>>clearly expressed in Part 97. Nothing, IMO, supports the current high
>>speed manual morse testing, especially on a pass/fail basis.

>

>No it boils down to "I loved to, why don't you?".

Thank you for stating it. (By the way, I just can't see the utility of it.)

>Part of the ARS was to keep a pool of train operators. IMHO, that means
>CW operators because voice operators coubld be easily found or trained
>whereas a CW op is a valuable and trained entity, a craftsman so to speak.

But almost no where is there a need for such a pool outside the ARS. If
there is no need for the pool, we serve no purpose. Glass blowing is a
craft too. We do not need a large pool of glass blowers. Technology has
progressed beyond that need.

Dan N8PKV

--

"We can't be so fixated on our desire to preserve the rights of
ordinary Americans.." -- President William Jefferson Clinton

Date: Fri, 16 Sep 1994 19:47:59 GMT
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!kahuna!jeffrey@ames.arpa
Subject: Sum'tin for nut'in and chicks for free
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

(Michael Silva) writes:

>Furthermore, it really makes no sense to pass a CW test to get access
>to band segments where nobody is working CW.

I promise you that if the automated digital chirpers continue their
downward trek they will force the CW ops to start exercising their
privilege to operate *anywhere* in the bands; this will result in
there no longer being ``...band segments where nobody is working
CW.''

These chirping crickets have moved *below* the national QRP CW
frequency of 7040 kc now.

Jeff NH6IL

Date: Wed, 21 Sep 1994 20:43:00 EST
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!cs.utexas.edu!convex!
news.duke.edu!eff!wariat.org!amcomp!dan@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <Jm3RX38.edellers@delphi.com>, <35mljm\$oqu@cat.cis.brown.edu>, <35o51m\$gh6@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>
Subject : Re: Get Over It

mancini@sugar.NeoSoft.COM (Dr. Michael Mancini) writes:

>In article <35mljm\$oqu@cat.cis.brown.edu>,
>Michael P. Deignan <md@pstc3.pstc.brown.edu> wrote:
>>In article <Jm3RX38.edellers@delphi.com>,
>> Ed Ellers <edellers@delphi.com> writes:
>>
>>> Bad argument. VHF and higher spectrum is fundamentally different from HF
>>> spectrum in its characteristics and therefore in its usefulness for different
>>> applications. You can't communicate from Massachusetts to Malaysia on 2m
>>> simplex any more than you could set up a reliable repeater on 20m.
>>
>>All hams know from the start what the no-code license offers. If they
>>want to engage in something that requires HF access, they have to learn the
>>code. I have zero sympathy for someone who gets a no-clue license and then
>>starts whining about HF access.
>
>I have followed the newsgroup for some time now, and it appears that the
>vast majority of the "whining" you cite is coming from just a few rather
>vocal posters. It also appears to me that they will continue to whine
>until someone of significant power yields to their faulty logic and
>grants them privileges they refuse to earn through mastery of Morse.
>
>And like you, Michael, I have absolutely no sympathy for these lazy bastards.

After wading thru the waist deep pile of human excrement of this post, or
should I say flame as there is no redeeming quality, it only goes to
futher the arguement that morse testing is no lid filter.

It also shows that one can obtain a Doctorate without the ability to
demonstrate intelegence let alone the ability to read.

Since you missed it Doctor (and BOY do I use that term loosely!) many of
those posting here for removal of the pass/fail high speed tests are
Extra class licensees and have passed the 20 WPM test.

Since you CLAIM (delusions perhaps?) that you have "followed" this group (obviously at a distance) for "some time" (Seconds? Minutes? or even [gasp!] HOURS?) you should have known this. We can assume that your reading skills lie somewhere below the third grade level then?

We can thus safely presume that your Phd was in Creative Basket Weaving?

That's OK, even the lazy bastards that refuse to read posts are free to respond on Usenet. And I for one will lay down my life to protect your First Amendment rights to do so (this applies to US residents of course, no offense to those in other countries).

>
>--
>"I'm not a real doctor, but I play one on television."

"Actors!" (disgusted tone...)

Dan N8PKV

--
"We can't be so fixated on our desire to preserve the rights of ordinary Americans.." -- President William Jefferson Clinton

Date: Wed, 21 Sep 1994 20:35:00 EST

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!cs.utexas.edu!convex!
news.duke.edu!eff!wariat.org!amcomp!dan@network.ucsd.edu

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <5C3w3Vp.brunelli_pc@delphi.com>, <Jm3RX38.edellers@delphi.com>,
<35mljm\$oqu@cat.cis.Brown.EDU>d
Subject : Re: Get Over It

md@pstc3.pstc.brown.edu (Michael P. Deignan) writes:

>In article <Jm3RX38.edellers@delphi.com>,
> Ed Ellers <edellers@delphi.com> writes:
>
>> Bad argument. VHF and higher spectrum is fundamentally different from HF
>> spectrum in its characteristics and therefore in its usefulness for different
>> applications. You can't communicate from Massachusetts to Malaysia on 2m
>> simplex any more than you could set up a reliable repeater on 20m.
>
>All hams know from the start what the no-code license offers. If they
>want to engage in something that requires HF access, they have to learn the
>code. I have zero sympathy for someone who gets a no-clue license and then

>starts whining about HF access.

You are a "no-clue" and you whine about HF!

>> You're forgetting that not everyone is capable of learning every subject.
>> Some are good at math, some at understanding theory, some are proficient in
>> languages, and some are expert at code. There are far too many of us who are
>> not "handicapped" in any real sense but who simply have extreme difficulty in
>> this one area for your "shut up and learn it" argument to hold any water.

>

>So, according to your logic, we should also offer a theoryless license in
>amateur radio too since some people may not be able to understand the
>theory.

I doubt that since he has supported the opposite many times.

But we expect that from a "no-clue" like you Mr. Deignan.

Dan

--

"We can't be so fixated on our desire to preserve the rights of
ordinary Americans.." -- President William Jefferson Clinton

Date: 21 Sep 1994 21:45:34 -0500

From: tulane!darwin.sura.net!news.sesqui.net!uuneo.neosoft.com!sugar.NeoSoft.COM!
not-for-mail@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <35mljm\$oqu@cat.cis.brown.edu>, <35o51m\$gh6@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>,
<092194204343Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>ail
Subject : Re: Get Over It

In article <092194204343Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>,

Dan Pickersgill <dan@amcomp.com> wrote:

>

>Since you missed it Doctor (and BOY do I use that term loosely!) many of
>those posting here for removal of the pass/fail high speed tests are
>Extra class licensees and have passed the 20 WPM test.

Are you one of the "many" who have passed the 20 WPM test, and thus earned
their Extra class license? If so, then you have just qualified your
arguments against the code requirement. If not, you are a whiner. Period.

--

"I'm not a real doctor, but I play one on television."

Date: Fri, 16 Sep 1994 19:52:13 GMT
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!kahuna!jeffrey@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <Bu1wndJ.edellers@delphi.com>, <Cw77yx.81M@news.Hawaii.Edu>, <h+6QHBB.edellers@delphi.com>, i
Subject : Re: Morse code as a common language? (was

In article <h+6QHBB.edellers@delphi.com> Ed Ellers <edellers@delphi.com> writes:
>
>Mr. Clarke, among other things, explained in late 1945 how AT&T could use a
>satellite, at a certain altitude, to get CBS and ABC network programming
>across the Pacific so you can watch it live in Hawaii instead of having to
>wait for a tape to be flown in. (To name only one application. This was in

Boy, I remember that - we'd get all the network programs one week
later than you folks (including our own Hawaii 5-0) - finally
in the late 70's we received the networks live.

NH6IL jeffrey@math.hawaii.edu

Date: Wed, 21 Sep 1994 20:38:00 EST
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!cs.utexas.edu!convex!
news.duke.edu!eff!wariat.org!amcomp!dan@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <5C3w3Vp.brunelli_pc@delphi.com>, <Jm3RX38.edellers@delphi.com>, <flaherty.780091244@bora-bora.pa.dec.com>at.org
Subject : Re: Get Over It

flaherty@pa.dec.com (Paul Flaherty) writes:

>Ed Ellers <edellers@delphi.com> writes:
>
>>Bad argument. VHF and higher spectrum is fundamentally different from HF
>>spectrum in its characteristics and therefore in its usefulness for different
>>applications. You can't communicate from Massachusetts to Malaysia on 2m
>>simplex any more than you could set up a reliable repeater on 20m.
>
>Sure you can. There are at least three VHF+ techniques that extend beyond
>the visible horizon:
>
>1. Amateur Satellites
>2. Moonbounce

>3. Meteor Burst

>

>Of course, these techniques are not usually applied by appliance operators.

ALL operators that I know who use those modes (and all I have heard of) use store bought equipment. One is the head tech guy for a major 2-way radio company around here and knows more about radio than most everyone I have seen on this group.

Dan

--

"We can't be so fixated on our desire to preserve the rights of ordinary Americans.." -- President William Jefferson Clinton

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #458
